

REMARKS

Claims 10 and 12-13 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 11, and 20 have been amended to clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. New Claim 2 has been added. Claims 1-9, 11, and 14-23 are pending.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-11 and 14-22 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Wang (6,604,107) in further view of Aoki (U.S. Publication 2001/0039531). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner has stated that Wang “fails to disclose creating a lot having a plurality of items, generating a lot listing from the identified listing of items, wherein the generated lot listing indicates a plurality of items to be auctioned as a lot in an electronic auction.”

The Examiner has suggested that Aoki discloses these limitation in paragraphs [0052] and [0057]. Aoki describes a system in which **a seller** “inputs information about items he or she will exhibit at an auction.” [0052]. The seller can exhibit multiple items by arbitrarily grouping them using “an operation to group the multiple items.” [0052]. During bidding, if “multiple items are collectively subject to auction as grouped items, individual items composing the grouped items are listed in the item introduction field 410, and further check boxes 411 are appended to each item....” [0057]. Having a **seller** use “an operation to group ... multiple items” arbitrarily is not the same as “**generating** a lot listing that includes a plurality of the identified items, wherein the lot listing is generated **based at least in part on the received attribute**” as recited in Claim 1. Therefore, Claim 1 is believed to be allowable.

As with Claim 1, independent Claims 11 and 20 similarly recite generating a lot listing in the manner described above and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Claims 2-9, 14-19, and 22-23 claims depend, directly or indirectly, from one of the foregoing claims and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

The foregoing amendments are not to be taken as an admission of unpatentability of any of the claims prior to the amendments.

Reconsideration of the application and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested based on the preceding remarks. If at any time the Examiner believes that an interview would be helpful, please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



Robyn Wagner
Registration No. 50,575
V 408-973-2596
F 408-973-2595

Dated: November 14, 2008

VAN PELT, YI & JAMES LLP
10050 N. Foothill Blvd., Suite 200
Cupertino, CA 95014